

of Katie King's photographs. There were six different photos. Riko described them as follows:

1. 'Katie' standing up, with hands and arms crossed over her chest. [This one Riko reproduces on p. 228 of his book.]
2. The same figure stepping out of the cabinet.
3. 'Katie' *en buste*, somewhat larger and more *en profile*.
4. Larger photo *en buste*, down to the knees. 'Katie' with her hands on Crookes' head. The latter sitting in front of 'Katie' in a crouching position.
5. 'Katie' walking in the room arm in arm with Crookes.
6. The same but larger and more distinct. In a somewhat different position.

What became of these photos I do not know.

G. ZORAB

The Jones Boys

SIR,—In Mr Fraser Nicol's review of Trevor Hall's *The Strange Case of Edmund Gurney* (*International Journal of Parapsychology*, Winter 1966), he rightly castigates Hall for dismissing as fraudulent experiments with a 'Miss B.' carried out in 1889-92 by Mrs Sidgwick and Miss Johnson, while omitting to describe the best-controlled of these experiments. Fraser Nicol comments on these experiments: 'As for fraud methods, I have thought up a few systems whereby perhaps Miss B's feats might be normally explained' (p. 52).

Earlier in his paper Fraser Nicol refers to 'the alleged "telepathy" powers of the fraudulent Jones boys' (p. 18). Will Mr Fraser Nicol please explain what are his reasons for dismissing the results of Soal's experiments with the Jones boys as fraudulent. Is it simply that Mr C. E. M. Hansel afterwards thought up a method by which he considered that the experimenters could have been deceived? In that case, shouldn't Fraser Nicol dismiss Miss B. as fraudulent on the ground that he has thought up a system whereby she might have cheated?

Mrs Goldney has recorded (this *Journal*, March 1960, p. 272) that she shares my own opinion that the Jones boys did not use the method of cheating suggested by Hansel, and she has pointed out that this opinion is shared by most, if not all, of those who repeatedly saw high scoring. I invite Fraser Nicol to explain those features of the experiments on which I based this opinion in my review of *The Mind Readers* (this *Journal*, June 1959, pp. 84-96, and especially, pp. 92-96).

C. W. K. MUNDLE

SIR,—My attention has been drawn to a paper by Mr Fraser Nicol, published in the *International Journal of Parapsychology* (Winter 1966 issue). In this he states that the late Mr Jack Salvin, who was Chairman of the Occult Committee of The Magic Circle in England, 'was summoned a few years ago to investigate the alleged "telepathic" powers of the fraudulent Jones Boys'. A little later Mr Nicol goes on to say that Salvin 'seems to have been entirely ignorant of the elementary principles of conjuring'.

One has an uneasy feeling that if Salvin had denounced the Jones Boys instead of stating that they were not using any conjuring code, he would perhaps have been proclaimed by Mr Nicol as a great expert in the pseudo-occult. It apparently does not strike Mr Nicol as odd that The Magic Circle should have appointed as Chairman of one of their specialist committees, a man who was 'entirely ignorant of the elementary principles of conjuring.'! Mr Salvin was, in fact, the leading exponent in Great Britain of feats of pseudo-telepathy, and several S.P.R. members will remember his seemingly miraculous demonstrations in this type of conjuring.

As an S.P.R. member who doubted the existence of genuine telepathy, he was asked to witness the Jones Boys' performance, and was astounded to find, contrary to his firm expectation, that they were using none of the recognised codes, with all of which, as an expert, he was familiar. As a result he signed a statement for me guaranteeing the boys were using no code. (See *The Mind Readers*, Soal and Bowden, Faber & Faber, London, 1959, pp. 173 ff.)

Mr Nicol does not think it right to mention that not a single person who witnessed the boys' high scoring told me that they thought it probable that they were fraudulent—that is the opinion of Mr Nicol who did not witness a single experiment with them. Since he omitted to mention this fact, perhaps I could draw attention to pp. 274–287 of *The Mind Readers*, where are printed testimonies in the boys' favour by well-known witnesses to their experiments, such as F. Bateman, M.Sc.(Lond.); G. W. Fisk, Council member and editor of S.P.R. *Proceedings & Journal*; Professor C. W. K. Mundle, Bangor University College; R. H. Thouless, Sc.D., Reader in Education in the University of Cambridge, and former President of the S.P.R.; and T. Whitehead, O.B.E., Ph.D., M.Sc., A.R.C.S., Bangor University College.

Mr Nicol's view that the Jones Boys were fraudulent appears to be based on the assumption that they used an ultrasonic whistle, or possibly a midget radio set. They were never found using either.

In the experiment carried out by the boys in their bathing suits and socks, I have no hesitation in saying that if Ieuan, the agent,

had concealed on his person either an ultrasonic whistle worked by a bulb, or a radio set, my careful search would have revealed it. Nor had Iuan any opportunity of getting rid of any such object because he was watched closely by C. W. S. my brother, who stood close to him from the last guess to the instant when I went over every inch of his costume and socks. Nor had he anything in his hands or mouth. See *The Mind Readers* p. 158.

Had anyone mentioned to us in 1956 the possibility of a whistle and bulb we should, of course, have tested the boys in a room with an oscillograph.

Mr Nicol quotes Mr Trevor Hall as saying in his book, *The Strange Case of Edmund Gurney*, that 'an eminent member of the Magic Circle, Dr Eric Dingwall, did not hesitate to point out some years ago how the Jones cousins might have obtained their enormous scores in card guessing' (reference not given). To my knowledge neither Dr Dingwall nor anyone else ever suggested at any time during the experiments that the boys might be using an ultrasonic whistle. I will ask Mr Nicol to state in answer to this letter whether this possibility occurred to *him* at the time? and if so, why he did not mention it to any one of his former colleagues or friends on the S.P.R. Council?—friends with more than one of whom he was in correspondence and some of whom he knew were witnessing the experiments and forming the view that the scoring was due to genuine telepathic faculty.

In spite of the fact that specific tests with an oscillograph were not employed to eliminate the hypothetical use of an ultrasonic whistle, nobody who witnessed their high scoring has told me that now, with hindsight, they have reversed their former opinion that the Jones Boys possessed quite exceptional and genuine telepathic powers.

S. G. SOAL

'Time and Extrasensory Perception' — some misprints corrected

SIR,—I should be obliged if you would publish the appended list of misprints contained in my paper *Time and Extrasensory Perception* (*Proceedings S.P.R.* 54, pp. 249–361).

H. A. C. DOBBS

Page

Correction required

(lines from *top* unless otherwise stated)

- p. 260 line 20: For ': as shown for example' read '. This is shown for example . . .'
p. 265 line 24: For 'I take that' read 'I take it that.'